



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PL  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,363	12/09/2003	Alex Fielding		1362
7590 Michael James Connor 4359 Cordero Drive El Dorado Hills, CA 95762		04/24/2007	EXAMINER NALVEN, ANDREW L	
			ART UNIT 2134	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/707,363	FIELDING ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Andrew L. Nalven	<b>Art Unit</b> 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 42-49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 40 and 41 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 April 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-49 are pending. Claims 42-49 have been withdrawn from consideration due to an election without traverse of claims 1-41.

***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 24 should read "a computer system to." Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 20 recites the limitation "the user." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 19, 21-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being**

anticipated by Hursey et al US Patent No. 7,107,617.

7. **With regards to claims 1, 22, 24-25,** Hursey teaches a method of screening a software file for viral infection (Hursey, column 3 lines 15-40, scan for viruses using virus definitions) the method comprising defining a database of known infected file signatures (Hursey, Figure 1 Item 12 – virus definitions), determining a signature for a file (Hursey, column 3 lines 57-67, determines manner of compression of file and data relating to the file) and screening that signature against the signatures contained in said database to determine if there is a match (Hursey, column 4 lines 1-17, compares file to virus signatures).

8. **With regards to claim 2,** Hursey teaches a match of signatures between the screened file and said database results in an action affecting the said screened file (Hursey, column 4 lines 13-16, if there is a match, actions are triggered for file).

9. **With regards to claim 3**, Hursey teaches the result of a non matching signature between the screened file and said database results in an action affecting the said screened file (Hursey, column 4 lines 16-25, screens file again against another signature, column 3 lines 5-10 allows continued file access).

10. **With regards to claim 4**, Hursey teaches the result of a non matching signature between the screened file and said database results in an action affecting the said database (Hursey, column 4 lines 16-25, moves to next signature).

11. **With regards to claims 6, 27**, Hursey teaches a match of signatures between the screened file and said database result in an alert or notification to a user of a local computer system (Hursey, column 3 lines 1-15, alert message generation).

12. **With regards to claims 8 and 19**, Hursey teaches said action is an electronic quarantine of said matched file (Hursey, column 3 lines 1-15, quarantine).

13. **With regards to claim 10**, Hursey teaches the database contains a flag set in memory to quarantine said screened files (Hursey, column 3 lines 1-15, file is sent to quarantine and file access requests are disallowed).

14. **With regards to claim 12**, Hursey teaches the database contains a flag set in memory to erase said files (Hursey, column 3 lines 1-15, deletion).

15. **With regards to claims 21, 23, 26**, Hursey teaches the step of determining a signature for the file and screening that signature comprises deriving a signature of the file and comparing the derived signature with signatures in the database (Hursey, column 3 lines 53-67, identifies file and compression type to determine signature of file to compare to database of virus signatures).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. **Claims 5, 7, 9, 11, 13-18, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hursey et al US Patent No. 7,107,617 in view of Halperin US PGPub 2004/0111632.**
17. **With regards to claim 5,** Hursey fails to teach a match of signatures between the screened file and said database result in an action affecting the database. However, Halperin teaches a match of signatures between the screened file and said database result in an action affecting the database (Halperin, paragraphs 0087-008, virus outbreak database logs all matches). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Halperin's method of taking action with the database based upon a match because it offers the advantage of allowing the determination of viruses that are spreading across multiple systems (Halperin, paragraph 0090).
18. **With regards to claims 7, 9 and 20,** Hursey fails to teach the computer system is connected via an electronic link to a remote central computer and wherein the database is updated via an electronic link between the computer hosting the database

Art Unit: 2134

and the remote central computer. However, Halperin teaches teach the computer system is connected via an electronic link to a remote central computer and wherein the database is updated via an electronic link between the computer hosting the database and the remote central computer (Halperin, paragraph 0087, receives relevant updates from antivirus vendor). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Halperin's method of interfacing with a remote central computer because it allows updating of virus definitions that allow greater likelihood of finding a new virus (Halperin, paragraph 0087).

19. **With regards to claim 11,** Hursey fails to teach the database containing a flag set in memory to release quarantine files. However, Halperin teaches a database containing a flag set in memory to release quarantine files (Halperin, paragraph 0058, administrator determines whether to remove quarantine and allow message to forwarded). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Halperin's method of removing quarantine flags because it offers the advantage of allowing the passing of a message that is not actually infected and was classified as infected inadvertently (Halperin, paragraph 0058).

20. **With regards to claims 13-18,** Hursey fails to teach the flag can be updated by remove software via an electronic link to end user computers. However, Halperin teaches the flag can be updated by remove software via an electronic link to end user computers (Halperin, paragraph 0058, administrator may remove quarantine and designate file as uninfected). At the time the invention was made, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Halperin's method of removing quarantine flags because it offers the advantage of allowing the passing of a message that is not actually infected and was classified as infected inadvertently (Halperin, paragraph 0058).

21. **With regards to claim 28,** Hursey teaches the sending of an alert or notification following a match condition (Hursey, column 3 lines 1-10), but fails to teach the notification sent to a network administrator of a remote server. However, Halperin teaches the notification sent to a network administrator of a remote server (Halperin, paragraph 0058). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Halperin's method of informing network administrators because it offers the advantage of allowing the passing of a message that is not actually infected and was classified as infected inadvertently (Halperin, paragraph 0058).

22. **Claims 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Hursey et al US Patent No. 7,107,617 in view of Fakes et al US PGPub 2005/0125694.

23. **With regards to claims 29-32,** Hursey fails to teach the apparatus being a part of a network firewall device, network intrusion detection system, network packet sniffer software, or network intrusion prevention system. However, Fakes teaches the apparatus being a part of a network firewall device, network intrusion detection system, or network intrusion prevention system (Fakes, paragraph 0019). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

utilize Fakes' method if implementing virus scanning because it offers the advantage of helping to prevent the propagation of malicious programs over the network (Fakes, paragraph 0019).

24. **With regards to claims 33-36,** Hursey fails to teach the apparatus being a part of a PDA, digital camera, cellular phone, or wireless device. However, Fakes teaches teach the apparatus being a part of a PDA, digital camera, cellular phone, or wireless device (Fakes, paragraph 0019). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Fakes' method if implementing virus scanning because it offers the advantage of helping to prevent the propagation of malicious programs over the network (Fakes, paragraph 0019).

25. **Claims 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Hursey et al US Patent No. 7,107,617 in view of Waldin et al US Patent No. 6,094,731.

26. **With regards to claim 38,** Hursey fails to teach the database being part of a bidirectional system for sending and receiving partial hash signatures. However, Waldin teaches a database being part of a bidirectional system for sending and receiving partial hash signatures (Waldin, column 3 lines 1-20 and 55-65). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Waldin's partial hash signature method because it offers the advantage of increasing the speed and performance of virus scanning (Waldin, column 3 lines 1-5).

Art Unit: 2134

27. **With regards to claim 39,** Hursey as modified teaches partial hash signatures are sent and received through a bidirectional request protocol set to determine a percentage of said file used in hash computation (Waldin, column 4 lines 40-67).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

28. Claims 40-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the requested percentage being based upon communication speed or file size.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L. Nalven whose telephone number is 571 272 3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 571 272 3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Nalven  
AN

  
KAMBIZ ZAND  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER